

(c) and such other recommendations as may be necessary to achieve the efficient, cost-effective conduct of the responsibilities of the United Nations.

(c) CONTENTS OF REORGANIZATION PLAN.—It is the sense of the Congress that the reorganization plan required by subsection (b)(1) should—

(1) constitute a comprehensive statement of United States policy toward reform of the United Nations;

(2) set forth an agenda to implement the reforms set forth in the plan in a timely manner;

(3) include specific proposals to achieve—  
(A) a substantial reduction in the number of agencies within the United Nations system, including proposals to consolidate, abolish, or restructure mechanisms for financing agencies of the United Nations that have a low priority;

(B) the identification and strengthening of the core agencies of the United Nations system that most directly serve the objectives of the United Nations set forth in the United Nations Charter;

(C) the increased cooperation, and the elimination of duplication, among United Nations agencies and programs.

(D) the consolidation of the United Nations technical cooperation activities between the United Nations Headquarters and the offices of the United Nations in Geneva, Switzerland, including the merger of the technical cooperation functions of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), the United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF), and the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM);

(E) the consolidation of the United Nations emergency response mechanism by merging the emergency functions of relevant United Nations agencies, including the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Food Program, and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees;

(F) a substantial reduction in, or elimination of, the cost and number of international conferences sponsored by the United Nations;

(G) a significant strengthening of the administrative and management capabilities of the Secretary General of the United Nations, including a cessation of the practice of reserving top Secretariat posts for citizens of particular countries;

(H) a significant increase in the openness to the public of the budget decision-making procedures of the United Nations; and

(I) the establishment of a truly independent inspector general at the United Nations; and

(4) include proposals to coordinate and implement proposals for reform of the United Nations such as those proposals set forth in the communique of the 21st annual summit of the Heads of State and Government of the seven major industrialized nations and the President of the European Commission at Halifax, Nova Scotia, dated June 15–17, 1995.

M. Shalikashvili for reappointment as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be granted permission to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 21, 1995, for purposes of conducting a full committee business meeting which is scheduled to begin at 9:30 a.m. The purpose of this meeting is to consider pending calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to hold a business meeting during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 21, 1995, at 10 a.m. in SD226.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on African Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 21, 1995, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL FINANCE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 21, 1995, to conduct a hearing on the oversight of the Export Administration Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRORISM, TECHNOLOGY AND GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Government Information of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, be authorized to meet during a session of the Senate on Thursday, September 21, 1995, at 2 p.m., in Senate Dirksen room G50, on Ruby Ridge incident.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### ICC FUNDING AND RAILROAD MERGERS

• Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss some concerns I have about the flurry of recent proposed mergers by certain rail carriers.

The Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill that we will consider later, terminates funding for the Inter-

state Commerce Commission at the end of year. Downsizing the Federal Government and eliminating Federal agencies is a goal I certainly support and I have supported elimination of the ICC, but as of today, reorganization of the ICC's statutory responsibilities has not been done. I understand the Commerce Committee is preparing to report out legislation to accomplish this reorganization and I support that effort as I believe we must not eliminate the Commission without reassigning their most important regulatory responsibilities.

In the meantime, the Commission continues its mission. One responsibility they have that I wish to comment on today is their review of proposed railroad mergers.

In the past several months we have seen two huge railroad combinations. The Burlington Northern/Sante Fe merger has been approved and appears to be moving toward completion. Now recently, the Union Pacific/Southern Pacific merger has been proposed. Little thought seems to have been given to the impact that both these mergers will have on the continued availability of effective and efficient railroad transportation. For example, what effect will these exceptionally large combinations have on consumers, shippers, and communities as well as on the surviving competing railroads? Consider the current critical rail transportation situation in the Midwest, as reported recently in the Journal of Commerce, where timely rail movement to market of grain, corn, and soybeans is seriously threatened. According to this article, which follows my remarks, because of a shortage of cars, freight rates are going up significantly.

What will be the impact of these megamergers on other railroads and their ability to provide a needed and competitive service? Take for example, a regional railroad such as Kansas City Southern Railroad Co., and I am sure there are others; will KCS survive as a reliable competitive line offering a needed service to thousands of shippers and hundreds of communities? If it and others like it do not survive as viable competitors, isn't it likely that the serious freight car shortage and escalating rate problems we're seeing, as reported by the Journal of Commerce, will become even more serious? And how about the consumers? Any such increased costs of necessity are passed on to them.

If all of this were not worrisome enough, the Union Pacific/Southern Pacific combination is being hurried through at a time when the only deliberative body charged with evaluating the ramifications of this sort of activity, the ICC, is threatened with legislative extinction. In the absence of the ICC, who is going to impartially assess the anticompetitive impact on the public of these mergers? Serious nationwide public policy issues are raised which must be addressed before the

##### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

#### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Thursday, September 21, 1995, at 9:30 a.m. in open session, to consider the nomination of Gen. John

merger of the Union Pacific and Southern Pacific Railroads is consummated. It is not my intention to prejudice the legitimacy of this merger, but only to be certain that the public interest is not adversely threatened.

Mr. President, these megamergers pose very serious questions which must be answered by the players themselves or the agencies charged with maintaining an essential competitive transportation system.

Mr. President, I ask that the Journal of Commerce article referred to in the body of my statement appear in the RECORD at this point:

The article follows:

[From the Journal of Commerce, Sept. 13, 1995]

#### RAILS STRAIN TO SERVICE MIDWEST GRAIN HARVEST

(By Rip Watson)

The U.S. Midwest's rail network, normally no stranger to the crunch of the fall harvest, is beginning to strain this year under the weight of strong demand, tight car supply and skyrocketing prices.

Conditions are so tense in Iowa that farm trade associations will hold a Grain Transportation Summit on Thursday in Des Moines to vent their frustrations with some rail carriers, while seeking ways to ease the problem before soybean harvests begin in a few days.

"Grain is hot. Export demand is huge and will continue to be that way in the foreseeable future," said Jim Higgins, an analyst for Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette in New York.

As an industry, railroads boosted grain carloadings 23% in August from a year ago. Burlington Northern Railroad led the pack with a 28% increase, followed by Union Pacific Railroad at 19%.

That higher traffic volume is proving to be little comfort to Iowa shippers.

"We are sitting with most of our facilities full," said Dawn Carlson of the Iowa Institute for Cooperatives. "People are getting concerned. Every day that goes by is tacking on more and more charges and the farmer will get less and less for the grain delivered. If we don't get the grain moving, we'll have a lot of grain sitting on the ground."

Arthur Breenken, manager for the Farmers Co-Op Society in Wesley, Iowa, said, "The Soo Line is shipping cars but they are not supplying them fast enough." He said the problem was that much Iowa grain is moving to the Gulf of Mexico instead of the Mississippi River, which lengthens the round trip time to more than 30 days.

John Bromley, a spokesman for Union Pacific, blamed rail unions for not allowing UP employees to work in Iowa, where the railroad is short staffed. UP is hiring and training new workers now, he said.

Without those industrywide increases, the Association of American Railroads would have been 1% lower than last year.

"Our export projections are strong," said Brad Clow, director of transportation for Sparks Commodities in Memphis, Tenn. "In some commodities, shipments could outdo USDA forecasts."

With export demand strong and the corn and soybean harvests expected during the next several weeks, industry observers see no changes in the rate and car supply situation.

"We expect cars to remain tight until January or February," Mr. Clow said.

"It would surprise me if we didn't continue to have this shortage problem for a while," said Steve Strege, who directs the North Dakota Grain Dealers Association in Fargo.

"We're just getting into the usual crunch time. I don't know if there is much precedent for us to have a problem at this time of year and have it relax at the time of corn and soybean harvest."

With shippers paying premiums of up to \$500 a car to guarantee availability of covered hopper cars for grain shipments late in 1995, Mr. Strege said he believed rates will continue to climb.

"We have people willing to pay a hell of a premium for cars," one official said.

"These programs (for ordering cars in advance) give signals to the railroads that they should or can raise their rates," Mr. Strege said.

Other forces are influencing the 1995 grain shipping picture.

Operating under a strike threat last year, CP Rail System's Soo Line unit posted meager grain carloadings in August 1994 that were nearly quadrupled last month.

Barge freight markets are facing similar pressures, several industry observers said.

One factor affecting the barge markets is the continued strong northbound river movements of aluminum ore, steel and other products that have reduced availability of barges to haul grain, said Jerry Fruin, a transportation economist for the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis.

"Even with the recent fall in rates in the past week, we expect barge freight rates will continue to remain very strong as we move into harvest," Mr. Clow said.

The traffic picture is brightening for some other commodities but remains dim for manufactured goods.

Coal traffic could pick up this month, Mr. Higgins said, because of the hot summer and a resulting reduction in utility stockpiles that have to be replenished.

Export traffic is showing some cyclical strength driven by demand for some steam coals and metallurgical coal, he said.

August carloadings were 2% below last year.

"We're expecting a strong fourth quarter (for coal)," said Dave Rohall, director of planning for CSX Transportation.●

#### FINAL PASSAGE OF WELFARE REFORM

● Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, on Tuesday, I spoke in opposition to final passage of the welfare reform bill. Although I was not able to complete my statement in the time available, I obtained unanimous consent that my full statement be printed in the RECORD. However, my full statement did not appear in the RECORD of September 19, 1995. Therefore, what follows is my full statement from that day.

Mr. President, I will vote against this bill because it will wipe out every protection for poor families with children but would do nothing at all to repair what is really wrong with welfare. We have made some improvements to the bill, such as eliminating the job-training consolidation that never belonged in a welfare bill in the first place. And there are sections I strongly support such as the child support provisions which I wrote. But the fundamental structure is deeply flawed and can only lead to deeper poverty and more dependency.

All we are really changing with this bill is the one thing that is not wrong with welfare—the financial relation-

ship between State and Federal bureaucracies. That is not the problem. In fact, block grants create a new problem because States that have increasing numbers of poor families, because of a bad economy or simple population growth, would not have enough funds to assist their people. Federal politicians should not simply transfer pots of money to State politicians without any standards about what the money would be used for. We do not need to transfer money from one bureaucrat to another; we need a commitment to individual poor children.

While this bill would abandon that commitment, the real problems with welfare would remain. The rules that penalize marriage and work. The indifferent local and county bureaucrats, who treat people as numbers and do nothing to help people take care of themselves. The brutal job market. The deeper cultural forces driving increases in divorce, illegitimacy and teen pregnancy. All these problems would remain. Many would get worse.

All this bill does is require States to penalize the children who are the victims of these problems. It does nothing to help them avoid the bleak circumstances into which they have been born and live today.

With all the rhetoric about changing welfare, how did we wind up with a bill that does nothing to change what is wrong with welfare? The answer is politics. Neither party was as serious about really changing welfare as it was about capturing "the welfare issue" from the other party. Democrats promised to "end welfare as we know it" by tinkering with the levers of government, mostly in positive ways, but not in a way that deeply changes the lives of people on welfare.

Republicans promised to do even better: "abandon the welfare state." They would toss aside the Federal responsibility for poor families and children altogether. But they did not know how to deal with the reality of poverty and welfare. So they came up with the solution of handing the whole problem over to States, for them to solve. Block grants create an appearance of change, not real change.

The debate of the last few days, during which we accepted every amendment that did not challenge the underlying political rhetoric and layered the bill with billions in new Government spending, brought this cynical politics into the light of day. It is politics as usual, made worse by the fact that it is a transparent deceit. We have not improved the bill; all we are accomplishing is to move the bill forward to a conference at which every single one of these provisions, including this massive last-minute compromise, will be dropped without debate in the first 5 minutes. Even if they became law, these ornaments do nothing to repair the deep fundamental flaw at the heart of this bill.

For those who think these provisions improve this bill enough to vote for it,